

Message Text

PAGE 01 KINGST 02419 211609Z

43

ACTION ARA-10

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ADP-00 NSC-10 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INR-10

NSAE-00 RSC-01 L-02 H-01 PRS-01 EB-03 USIA-04 RSR-01

/058 W

----- 021933

P 211440Z JUL 73

FM AMEMBASSY KINGSTON

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2420

UNCLAS KINGSTON 2419

LIMDIS

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PINT JM

SUBJ: EDITORIAL REACTION TO GOJ REQUEST FOR AMBASSADORS RECALL

1. THE ISLANDS TWO LEADING DAILIES HAVE PREDICTABLY BACKED THE PRIME MINISTER'S REQUEST FOR THE RECALL OF OWE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR FOLLOWING THE AMBASSADORS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE CHURCH SUBCOMMITTEE. THE NEW PNP BACKED TABLOID "THE JAMAICA DAILY NEWS" ASSERTED THAT THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR HAD BEEN IN JAMAICA TOO LONG, LACKED ADEQUATE PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND HAD COUNTENANCED A CONTINUING AFFRONT TO NATIONAL DIGNITY IN THE MANNER IN WHICH HE PERMITTED THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY TO TREAT JAMAICAN VISA APPLICANTS. INFLUENTIAL DAILY GLEANER, JULY 21 DELIVERED A MORE RESTRAINED EDITORIAL SUPPORTING THE PRIME MINISTERS ACTION AND SEARCHING FOR THE UNDERLYING ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE CONFRONTATION. THE GLEANER CONCLUDED WITH A CALL FOR A FULLER EXPLANATION FROM THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OF ALLEGED US INVOLVEMENT IN A JAMAICAN NATIONAL ELECTION. TEXT FOLLOWS:

2. QUOTE THE DE ROULET AFFAIR

THE CONTROVERSY THAT HAS ARISEN OVER WHAT PASSED BETWEEN THE US AMBASSADOR, MR. DEROULET, AND THE PRIM MINISTER, MR. MANLEY, DURING THE PERIOD PRECEDING LAST YEAR'S GENERAL ELECTION, SEEMS TO TOUCH NOT SO MUCH ON WHAT WAS SAID, BUT ON THE INTERPRETATION
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 KINGST 02419 211609Z

TO BE PLACED ON WHAT THEY TOLD EACH OTHER. ONE THING WE DO KNOW FOR SURE, FROM WHAT MR. DEROULET HAS SAID IN TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND FROM MR. MANLEY'S STATEMENT IN RESPONSE, IS

THAT BOTH MEN DID COMMUNICATE WITH EACH OTHER ABOUT US INTEREST IN THE ELECTIONS ON THE ONE HAND, AND POLICY TOWARDS THE BAUXITE INDUSTRY ON THE OTHER.

IN PARTICULAR WE KNOW AS A FACT, FROM THE STATEMENTS OF BOTH MEN FIRSTLY, THAT IN ANSWER TO MR. MANLEY'S ENQUIRIES, MR. DE ROULET GAVE AN ASSURANCE OF US NEUTRALITY OR NON-INTERFERENCE IN THE ELECTIONS, AND SECONDLY THAT MR. MANLEY INFORMED HIM THAT IT WAS NOT THE PNP'S POLICY TO NATIONALIZE BAUXITE AND THAT HE WOULD NOT BE MAKING THE QUESTION AN ELECTION ISSUE. THE CRUX OF THE MATTER IS THAT MR. DEROULET IN HIS STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE HAS INTERPRETED THE ASSURANCES THAT HE AND MR. MANLEY GAVE EACH OTHER AS BEING SOMETHING IN THE NATURE OF A QUID PRO QUO, AND THEREFORE AMOUNTING TO A DEAL, WHILE MR. MANLEY HAS VIGOROUSLY DENIED THAT THERE WAS ANYTHING OF THE SORT. WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS INDEED ANYTHING THAT COULD BE CALLED A DEAL IN HARD AND FAST TERMS IS A RATHER SUBTLE MATTER EXTREMELY DIFFICULT OF PROOF, UNLESS ONE HAS ACCESS TO THE VERBATIM RECORD OF WHAT PASSED BETWEEN THE TWO MEN. FOR THE BARE FACTS AS OUTLINED ABOVE COULD BE CONSISTENT WITH AT LEAST FOUR DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES. FIRSTLY, IT COULD HAVE BEEN THE CASE THAT EACH SIDE WAS GIVING ONLY A UNILATERAL ASSURANCE, INDEPENDENTLY OF ANY COMMITMENT GIVEN BY THE OTHER; SECONDLY, THAT ONE SIDE INTENDED HIS COMMITMENT TO BE CONTINGENT ON THAT OF THE OTHER, WHILE THE LATTER HAD NO SUCH INTENTION; THIRDLY, THAT THOUGH EXPRESSLY AND FORMALLY GIVEN AS UNILATERAL ASSURANCES, BOTH MEN INFORMALLY UNDERSTOOD THEIR COMMITMENTS TO CONSTITUTE AN UNSPOKEN BARGAIN; AND FOURTHLY, THAT THEY CLEARLY, CONSCIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY ENTERED INTO A FIRM DEAL.

THIS MATTER IS ONE OF GRAVE CONCERN TO THE COUNTRY WHETHER OR NOT THERE WAS A FIRM DEAL BETWEEN MR. DEROULET AND MR. MANLEY. IT THERE WAS SUCH A DEAL, IT MEANS THAT AN IMPORTANT AREA OF PUBLIC POLICY WAS BEING REMOVED FROM THE COMPETENCE OF OUR DOMESTIC POLITICAL PROCESSES, AND BEING DETERMINED BY COERCIVE FOREIGN INFLUENCE RATHER THAN BY OUR OWN NEEDS, VALUES AND PERSPECTIVES. EVEN IF THERE NEVER WAS ANY SUCH DEAL, IT UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 KINGST 02419 211609Z

IS NEVERTHELESS ALARMING THAT MR. DEROULET, JUDGING FROM THE GENERAL ATTITUDE REVEALED IN HIS TESTIMONY, SHOULD REGARD HIMSELF AS HAVING A SPECIAL PRIVILEGE TO INTERFERE IN THE ELECTIONS, WHICH HE COULD THEN USE AS A WEAPON TO THREATEN OR BARGAIN WITH LOCAL POLITICIANS.

INDEED, IT IS REGRETTABLE THAT MR. MANLEY HIMSELF SEEMED TO BE CONCEDED THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH A PRIVILEGE WHEN HE SOUGHT TO KNOW OF MR. DEROULET WHETHER THE PNP COULD RELY ON THE US GOVERNMENT TO REMAIN NEUTRAL IN THE 1972 ELECTIONS. SUCH ACTION ON THE PART OF MR. MANLEY HAS THE EFFECT OF HELPING TO CONVERT THE POWER AND CAPACITY OF THE US TO INTERFERE IN DOMESTIC POLITICS INTO A RIGHT TO DO SO.

MR. SHEARER WAS SAID BY MR. DEROULET IN HIS EVIDENCE, TO HAVE

BEEN PUBLICLY DISCUSSING NATIONALISATION IMMEDIATELY BEFORE THE ELECTION. ON OUR RECORDS, MR. SHEARER HAS NEVER GIVEN ANY INTIMATION AT ALL OF INTENTION TO TAKE OVER THE BAUXITE OR ANY OTHER FOREIGN-OWNED INDUSTRY, OR SAID ANYTHING TO THIS EFFECT. MR. MANLEY SIMILARLY NEVER RAISED BAUXITE NATIONALISATION AS AN ISSUE IN THE ELECTIONS; AND IN FACT SINCE TAKING OVER THE GOVERNMENT, HAS BEEN GIVING ALL FOREIGN INVESTORS IN THE ISLAND THE UTMOST ASSURANCE OF THE PROTECTION OF THEIR INTERESTS, AND HAS IN FACT STRESSED THE IMPORTANCE TO THE FUTURE OF STILL MORE FOREIGN CAPITAL ENTERING THE COUNTRY TO HELP TO FURTHER ITS DEVELOPMENT. THE PUBLIC PRONOUNCEMENTS AND BEHAVIOUR OF NEITHER OF THE TWO POLITICAL PARTY LEADERS CAN THEREFORE BE SAID TO CONSORT WITH WHAT MR. DEROULET HAS CLAIMED.

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION THAT ARISES FROM ALL THIS IS WHETHER PROBLEMS SUCH AS THESE STEM NATURALLY FROM THE FACT OF OUR BEING A SMALL COUNTRY EXISTING IN THE SHADOW OF A MAJOR POWER. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THIS IS NECESSARILY THE CASE. WE ARE SURE THAT, WITHOUT EVEN CONSIDERING THE POSSIBILITIES OF TOTALITARIAN REGIMENTATION, THERE ARE MEASURES WHICH CAN BE TAKEN TO INSULATE OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM FROM THE KIND OF EXTERNAL INTERFERENCE THAT MR. DEROULET ASSUMED HE WAS ENTITLED TO CARRY OUT, AND THAT MR. MANLEY FEARED.

WE MUST TRY TO OBTAIN A THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING OF THE FORMS THAT SUCH INTERFERENCE HAS TAKEN OR IS LIKELY TO TAKE IN OUR PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES, AND DEMKSE MEASURES TO COMBAT IT. THIS WOULD CONSTITUTE A FURTHER IMPORTANT, AND INDEED, NECESSARY, STEP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLITICAL LIFE OF THE COUNTRY. OTHERWISE, IT IS BOTH OUR INDEPENDENCE AND OUR ASPIRATIONS FOR A

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 KINGST 02419 211609Z

DEMOCRATIC ORDER THAT WILL BE AT STAKE. IN VIEW OF ALL THIS MR. MANLEY SHOULD, WITH THE LEAST POSSIBLE DELAY, INITIATE A DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN WHICH MR. SHEARER WOULD NO DOUBT TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE HIS OWN POSITION CLEAR. THE STATE DEPARTMENT IN WASHINGTON CERTAINLY SEEMS TO US TO OWE SOMETHING FAR MORE EXPLANATORY THAN THE BRIEF DENIAL RECORDED BY ITS SPOKESMAN ON THURSDAY. NOTHING LESS THAN A FULL STATEMENT FROM THIS QUARTER WILL DO. UNQUOTE.

SLATER

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 21 JUL 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973KINGST02419
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: KINGSTON
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730768/abqcefqy.tel
Line Count: 153
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ARA
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification:
Previous Handling Restrictions: LIMDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 18 JAN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <18-Jan-2002 by phillir0>; APPROVED <26 FEB 2002 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status:
Subject: EDITORIAL REACTION TO GOJ REQUEST FOR AMBASSADORS RECALL
TAGS: PINT, JM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005